

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/786,032	IIDA, HIROSHI	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Elmira Mehrmanesh	2113	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Elmira Mehrmanesh. (3) Srikant Viswanadham.  
 (2) Aashish Karkhanis. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 11 September 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Omori et al. (U.S. PG PUB No. 20020184405).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Please refer to the attached summary for details.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

### **Interview Summary**

In an applicant initiated personal interview on September 11, 2007, with the applicant's representatives, Aashish Karkhanis and Srikant Viswanadham, the following arguments were presented with regards to claim 1 of the present application discussing the prior art Omori et al. (U.S. PG PUB No. 20020184405).

Applicant's representative believes the difference between the application and Omori is the processing linkage, which is done in sequence based on the specific processing of the service. Applicant's representative and Examiner agreed that further search/consideration of the possible amendments may be required.